

Mr. Nyland: Now what--Are we going to talk about Gurdjieff or not? Or about different things of life leading to Gurdjieff--What is interesting? Are there any--Some of you know of course that it is very difficult to start at a certain place and end at another because I don't know during that particular voyage we talk about the things that you want to talk about or perhaps that you might have some questions on and maybe it is better if we start with that kind of thing of finding out what is it that you would like to get some clarification on if it is possible for me to give it.

So what is in your mind, particularly those there--have they read Gurdjieff?

Yes.

Yeah?

Some yes, some no. We've been introduced to--

N: What brings you now here?

The opportunity to--to--

N: to hear a little more?

Yes. Learn some more.

N: What would you like to hear, more?

I--uh--have no idea.

N: What do you think Gurdjieff stands for? When we say we talk about Gurdjieff, alright. Some ideas? In what way are they special Gurdjieffian and not belong to someone else, and in what way of course are they similar to what someone else may be talking about. In other words, what is attractive in Gurdjieff that you may not find with someone else? Or if that what is attractive is not entirely clear, then let's talk about how to clarify it. What do you think is

the quintessence of Gurdjieff? You've read some. What did you read?

I--uh--read part of the--ALL AND EVERYTHING.

N: How far did you get?

I read through it.

N: You did? Did you like it?

Certain parts.

N: You're still on the way to read it for the second time?

Yes.

N: And you're going to read it aloud?

Yes.

N: As if you're reading it to someone else?

Yes, I've tried to--if I could do this--

N: What do you find in it? In that book? What appeals to you?

The feeling of--uh--life.

N: Well, you could find that in other books.

Yes, but-uh--

N: What is specific?

It's something.

N: Yah, it has to be. Something you can put your teeth in.

Yes.

N: Would you consider some kind of food?

Yes, I think that it's a nourishment that I can--

N: And what do you think is being nourished?

Uh--my--uh, my soul.

N: Have you got one?

Yes, I think I do?

N: Yes? Gurdjieff says of course, you don't. That a soul has to be made. And maybe a beginning of a soul is there and if you refer to that, I think you are very lucky. A soul is something quite different

from ordinary life. A soul does not belong to Mother Nature. It doesn't belong to life on earth. A soul belongs to some kind of a realm which is not earthly. Otherwise you wouldn't call it a soul. And usually the concept of soul is connected with a form of existence very often after death. Because the point at which a soul could start to become functioning would be that when a person who has this soul is released from the bondage of earth. So, when he dies. And of course, many times the assumption is that he has a soul so then all ^{that} is necessary is to go from one place to another as if he steps from his physical body into his soul body. And then continues to live. Do you think that's true?

I believe so.

N: What makes you think you have a soul--or rather how would you define that now?

Uh--let's say--uh-- a certain feeling that I could sense about myself, something that I strive to--

N: Do you call that a soul?

I think--uh--that is part of the soul--or something that I'm trying to--uh--sense about the soul--or--

N: Do you have a certain idea of what the soul looks like?

Uh.

N: when you talk about it. And you say you have a soul. Do you have anything that would indicate that something exists that you would call soul and if so, can you describe it?

I've had some experiences through drugs that has--given me-- uh-- an inkling about this thing that I'm interested in Gurdjieff's writings about--and--uh--this--uh--experiences seem to indicate uh--much more than I can understand or sense about--

N: Do we have to talk about drugs?

It seems to be--here.

N: Yes, but many things are here. The question is only, what can a drug give you and to what extent, if it gives you something that is desirable, do you become dependent on the drug? And if you now go and see what does a drug do to a human being, have you any idea of how it affects you. Except that it gives you a certain insight? Or an experience? What was it, LSD?

LSD--

N: Marijuana?

Marijuana.

N: What does it give you?

It stimulates the mind to imagine things and in that frame of mind it brings more things to consider in relation to your--

N: Do you need a drug for that?

Personally, I do need drugs, I smoke Marijuana and I'm interested in Peyote and Mushrooms, but this are ways of --uh--

N: Would you advocate it for different people to do the same thing?

No, I wouldn't.

N: Why not?

Because I sense that it is only my need and I could not--

N: How do you know it's your own need, have you tried other ways?

No, sir.

N: Then how do you know that is the need? Supposing you try to do it without the drug would you be able to have let's call it a creative impulse?

Yes, I think so.

N: And if you really scientifically wanted to investigate don't you think it would be interesting to see if you could produce the same

kind of a state without the drugs? By wishing it for instance, very much? Maybe by sitting quiet, or by enjoying certain things or even the impulse that you wish to create? Why is a drug necessary. A drug is foreign to your body. It is, of course, a chemical that affects you, and particularly, let's say LSD about which many people now read and apply and who have experience of expansion of consciousness, and at such a time a facility of experiencing certain things that they don't experience in ordinary life, but why call that a soul? I have some alcohol I also am free from certain inhibitions and of course I feel sometimes like a different man, and sometimes quite enjoy it if I don't take too much and I don't get sick. But don't you think that in doing that I become a little dependant on the drug and at any time that I want that kind of a state I have to run to a drug and take it. Would you consider that a normal condition for a human body, do you think that a human body needs it? Aside from the fact that they exist it does not mean that I want to put certain things in my body which of course will produce an effect but about which I really know very little then only that I experience something that is desirable. Do you think that that becomes a picture of a man? You see, let's define that. What do you really want and how would you define a certain man to be as man, what do you understand by it? Not the person of course, who has hallucinations or a person who temporarily is affected by something as an influence on his brain because that is not a man. It happens to be a certain experiment that he carries out by means of his body, exposing it to certain chemicals, that's about all you can say, because there is absolutely no reason to assume that that will form a drug--uh--form a soul in you, as a result of the drug. Put your head a little bit down (Aside to a girl). You see what I mean, it is very

necessary to define first what a man is and what he is supposed to become, if there is any possibility for a man to grow and again the question is should he grow or should he continue to live on earth as well as he can with or without drugs, with all kind of esthetic feelings, with an interest in certain things because of reading or intellectual pursuits, or what is really needed for a man to grow into if there is a possibility for him to grow. It all comes down to how I look at myself, how I should be and do, when I take a drug does that help me to become what I should be. Let's call it an ideal man and if I am interested in myself as I find myself as a growing kind of a person, a creature on earth, I have to have a certain aim or perhaps I try to find out if I can, what is the reason that I exist and then if I exist, what for now should I use that what is my equipment, what direction should I go, in what sense would I find a possibility in that what I would ultimately like to reach, now the satisfaction that I know that now I'm on my road towards it. If that is all involved in taking a drug, I would go with you. But let's define first what do we expect a man to be or to become. What is the real purpose of a man as he is on earth? Or, if we know what we are on earth, and we know enough about man in general, do you think that they are what they are supposed to be?

Now aside from that, you advocate for yourself because you think that it is necessary, certain means in order to reach a certain state, but you don't advocate it for someone else. What are they going to do?. If it's good for you, why shouldn't it be good for someone else. Or if it is an exceptional thing, why should you be exceptional? See, aren't we all alike the same in that way except perhaps that one is a little more brilliant and another has a little bit more feeling and perhaps one is taller and another shorter. The equipment of human beings is very much the same. They are pronounced more or less in a certain direction, but in a general way we call it a human being, having a certain personality.

We can distinguish between different kinds of personalities, but they don't really amount to very much. We all eat, we all sleep, we drink a little bit, we are full, we are active. we work sometimes for a living, we keep on breathing, we reproduce, we have a heart, a blood circulation, all the rest-- a nervous system, everything. I think it's very much the same. And they are normal, more or less, healthy, equipped to keep track of what we are doing, and don't use anything to excess. That's a human being. And I call it a man. Now is that the man you'd like to be or do you believe you could change? And why select drugs, now, to change?

Because it's the only nourishment that I've found now that--

N: What, drugs?

Yes.

N: You mean you have never found it in any other way?

No. Specifically the effect of drugs are peculiar to their own nature.

N: Sure, I don't deny that there is an effect. Have you ever been exhilarated without drugs?

Oh. Yes.

N: Yeah. Why can't you produce such states? You see, I don't object particularly to the chemicals in the body, the trouble is that the kind of chemicals that I would put in by means of drugs are not primarily organic. They don't belong to the body. If the body produced them, like the body produces enzymes, endocrine glands, etc., there are definitely certain chemicals that have certain functions. But such as this that is synthetically made that I call a drug, it can have a certain effect on me and particularly if I can imitate by means of a chemical, something in which my body is deficient, like iodine, that I will take some. () or whatever it is that I need in order to augment the functions of my particular glands. Or

whatever may be as a medicine that I want to use in order to bring back a better equilibrium to myself. But the question here is, in the first place, it is something that I don't know very much about, it is not primarily a live matter, it is just pure chemical, it has not substance in itself that really could produce even life, and at the same time, when I put it in my body, my body has to take care of it. That even in the process of changing my mind, I cannot help that the drug is there, and, if it is foreign to the body, it'll have to be eliminated. I think I run a tremendous risk. I don't even know what the risk is aside from the fact that everybody claims of course that it is not habit forming. It already becomes a habit when I say, I would like to induce a nice state as a result of LSD, therefore I take it. I think it's quibbling about words because when I want to be able to produce it in such a way that I feel that when I take it I reach that kind of a state, of course I become involved in having all kinds of bodies-- foreign bodies in my body which have to be taken care of. I think I'm playing a little bit with fire. If I knew what would happen, if it had been sufficiently investigated so that there would be a sufficient number of case histories about the effect of LSD, I think I would probably be on a little firmer ground. But as it is at the present time, surely it is in its infancy. And that it does produce certain effects, there is no question. But what are the effects? As you know, the claim is made, "enlarging of the intellect. Consciousness" And what? All it means, is that the different molecules or whatever constitutes now the functioning in my brain are simply expanded. So that there is more room between them. And as a result, the different forms that I now call memory, things that have been put in my brain and I could recall at times, that now can be recalled a little easier, because apparently there is more flexibility, more chance of movement, and as a result they will come more to my so-called consciousness, because there is more facility. And that what produces a certain state of freedom, which after

the drug has worked off, is again reduced to its ordinary normal state and I hope, I have no way of proving it, that if I do this for several times that it will not have any bad effect. I assume that the brain is sufficiently elastic. So that when it is now expanding, that it will return again to its original form when the drug has worked sufficiently out. Well, I'm afraid the trouble also after a little while (the brain) loses elasticity. So this is the danger that arises if I don't know enough about it, but I think the greatest danger is, there are some chemicals that have been eliminated. If we take the body, the body is interested in protecting itself. That is, it doesn't want to die. I mean this is a known fact. When I give it a certain poison there is an antitoxin that is formed in the body in order to eliminate the effects as soon as possible, and, if possible, to eliminate the substance. And I know my blood functions that way and starts to protect immediately whenever there is a wound with a certain, let's say crystallization so as to exclude any kind of bad germs from the outside and to help the blood to start to function; whenever there is anything in my body that is hurt the blood rushes towards it in order to furnish more food. If I take arsenic, I certainly establish in myself a certain antitoxin to take care of the arsenic if it is not too much and by doing this I can train my body to learn to add a little more of this antitoxin to go against the arsenic and after a little while my body becomes used to a certain quantity of arsenic which is not poisonous for me simply because I have shifted the equilibrium a little of my body in such a way that it can take care. But that it is abnormal there is no doubt because as soon as it, say, stops taking the quantity of arsenic I die. So the body is not normal but it has adjusted itself. And of course, within certain limits the body will adjust itself. Only when the limit is transgressed it does not adjust and it dies. But how do you know that

taking some LSD or peyote or any of the others that perhaps you change and you disturb the equilibrium of your body. How much do you know about your body. I am sure you don't know a damn thing about it. You have absolutely no idea of how the different things attack now in this certain equilibrium as far as I say acidity and alkalinity is concerned. The quantity of water that is needed in order to keep yourself going. That's what is called a form of life and each particular cell, what is needed for breathing, what takes place when you breath, what takes place when your blood is circulating. You have no idea whatsoever. You will eat because everyone says you must eat this and that. Unless you become a fiend of diets and then you will probably have a deficiency one way or another. I think you are playing with such fore[?] really that you are risking something of what I believe ought to be extremely useful to you. That is your body. And what you reach by it, this so called expanded consciousness in which certain sorts of feelings that you have come to the foreground and and then you recall them and they are pleasant. Now the question is, "Is that a state that man would like to have?" To have more and more pleasant feelings. Is that really an aid as a man? That he has more joy? Life as we know it, should it always be joyful? Apparently it isn't for lots of people and surely it is not for those people you would advocate should never take LSD. But in your own case are you really satisfied by having such pleasurable moments? What can you do with them? This is another thing. You are lost. You are under the influence of something and there is absolutely nothing in you which is not under that influence. And you are really drunk in exactly the same way as if because of alcohol. And that becomes apparent because you cannot walk straight. Here it is not so apparent because it happens to be local in your brain.

Now we say that you have certain thoughts and feelings in that brain when its under that kind of an influence. What can you do with it? That a thought should create? Is it at that time when you undergo that

kind of an experience something that now makes you write or produce pictures or artistic-uh-vehicle in some way or other that there is something that you now produce in a creative sense? What good has it done you so far than only giving you a little additional like. And is that a man? Who really is interested in only a little joy. And then even induced by something that is not his own? And without doubt he becomes dependent on it? And then you call it a soul. You have no idea what a soul is. But you use the word because it is used. Surely. We even talk about soul-full expressions on one's face. I think it's very necessary to determine first what you want. And then to see if in this particular road of following the drug habit, I call it a habit because it is that, because you cannot break it, in following that you reach that what is your aim. As long as we cannot agree on a particular aim there is no use in talking. As far as Gurdjieff is concerned, drugs are absolutely out. And the simple reason is that Gurdjieff claims that one can reach certain states of consciousness without the aid of drugs, without running the risk that the body has to eliminate them, and without risking impairing your health. Or the condition of your brain. And that the brain can continue to function in its normal way which the drug will never allow you. If you want to carry on research it is a different thing. But the trouble is that whenever you want to have on research it is someone has to be an observer. And there is no observer when you take a drug. And a person who wants to observe you is another person, also has to take a drug in order to have more or less similar experiences so that then in that drug-land, you can converse together. Come down to earth. And, my advice, don't be stupid. If you know that there are possibilities for yourself to reach a certain state of, I call it exhilaration, that is of a certain form of aliveness in which you seem to have at such a time, really, such wish to want to continue to live and to be able to do certain things that otherwise seem impossible, in other words that you have with yourself, a

certain spirited way of wanting to take your life and use it for whatever you can and that then you are a fool in spoiling that what is your body in such a way that it becomes unmanageable. And that's really what it is. You're not normal when you have a drug. Absolutely not. And it's of no use to you. And only this very nice pleasing passing feature of having a little bit of fun. Or to be high, as they say it. No one who has ever created--really--has ever taken any drug. There are people who take drugs for certain definite reasons, of course. We know that. We know the Indians do take it for religious experiences. And sometimes the drug is taken in order to have pre vision or at least pre-cognition of certain things that might--but we cannot get the para-extra-sensory perception so soon. That it may be possible then in that kind of a looseness to have concepts that we cannot have in ordinary life. And particularly concepts about time. So of course there are many reasons why one can every once in a while take a drug for a definite purpose but not for the purpose of just having a little fun. And that of course is the way at the present time LSD is being taken in general and it is so called advocated and it is now a little bit-- well-- One has to do it because it seems the thing to do. And you fall prey to that. How can you? Every person who takes drugs at the present time ought to be ashamed. Because there is another way of becoming really a man. You don't need drugs for it. You can get drunk on reading. You can get drunk in admiration of someone you really admire. And whose life is worthwhile to try to follow. You can get drunk with ideas which might give you at certain times an insight in the possibilities of let's say real recognition of what man ought to become. And then we can perhaps from that standpoint try to do something about one's life. But where is this--this nonsense of a drug? If you think that is Gurdjieffian you are, of course entirely wrong and you don't know anything about Gurdjieff and I'm sorry even that reading

ALL AND EVERYTHING hasn't given you anything not in that sense. It is so different, this expansion of a brain that has nothing to do with self-consciousness--nothing. Self-consciousness is a different level of being, the brain remains on the same level and the drug is subjective matter. Again it has nothing to do with objectivity. Well, it's not necessary to continue to talk about drugs too much because we want to talk about work. Really, if you want to know about Gurdjieff. But revise your viewpoint, it is so stupid, honestly.

What other questions about work? Who wants work? Yes?

Q: Where is the beginning of work?

N: The beginning of work is to try to become observant of yourself. To establish in yourself a certain form of consciousness which in the sense of Gurdjieff is called "to become objective to oneself". The reason I want to become objective is that at the present time what I know or think or feel about myself may not be the entire truth or if it is the truth it is a little bit colored because it is always has a personal interpretation and that many times that what I think I am I am not or that I would recognize as something that I believe I am I start to interpret it in such a way that perhaps my feeling enters into it hoping that it is a little better than it actually is and that many times that I sometimes must come to the conclusion that I'm this and that and I don't like it and I find all kinds of reasonings or all kinds of rationalizing processes in which I will change it just a little in order to be able to live with myself. It's a question of having to face the truth, that I'm interested in finding the truth and whatever it is that truth will tell me about myself I ought to be from a scientific standpoint even more interested in a kind of interpretation that I know to be faulty, slightly away from the reality of that what I am. So that objectivity means that I want to become free from certain things which are now experience in a subjective world and I simply ascribe to a subjective world the conditions in which I am, which involve that I happen to think or feel about myself and

not establish for me what is absolute truth. It is problematical, of course to say, should I become interested in absoluteness or why should I become more truthful. I think it is a perfectly good question. Because as far as life on earth as we know it now is concerned we don't really care about it as long as everybody knows that we're all the same it doesn't really matter if I tell a lie as long as you know its a lie. I can live with it-- I also can live with myself as long as I don't probe too deeply and I sometimes don't want to face it so I close up and I continue to live and things that I don't want to see I can avoid in most cases or sometimes I'm forced to have to face them and perhaps I suffer a bit but with the suffering I say, well, it won't last, tomorrow I'll be alright. You see this state of accepting that what I know about myself, what I think or feel and what sometimes other people tell me, all of that naturally I live with, it is my personality and I've no objection for that personality to be what it is as long as I can get along with other people on this earth and more or less take and give whatever I can take and give. You see, that idea of the continuation of life on earth until I die, of course, why should I worry. Because I'm not concerned then with any possibility of having something that I would like if I know I cannot do it I simply say I cannot do it, I'm sorry. If I reach the limit of what I can do--I reach the limit of that waht I can face or I reach the limit of what I can--I can come to a state in which I am completely self-satisfied and as long as I'm there I have no interest whatever in wanting to change it. If on the other hand there is something in me that is not satisfied then, of course, I will try to find out what is it that prevents me from being satisfied and again it is logical, it does not mean that I need it, not on earth--I'm perfectly alright on earth as long as I take care of my body as long as I can think, as long as I'm clear enough about this and that and jovial and "hail fellow well met" and make a little money so that I can keep on living and be selfish and have some free time or whatever it

is. Fine. Who would worry about tomorrow? I don't--

--"I do"--

N: Yeah. That's fine. And if you do, then you have to define what it is that you really want and what you are dissatisfied with. That you see is the first step.

This I know. I know what I'm dissatisfied with.

N: What are you dissatisfied with?

With the cycle of repeating exactly what you were talking about, that is, realizing that you avoid that which doesn't flatter you, you seek that which does flatter you, when the world affirms you, you are happy, when it doesn't affirm you, you're not happy. I see this cycle in myself.

N: Good. Now you want to get out of it.

--how to get out of it. Who is my--(both talk) to go to--

N: Will we consider that a form of subjectivity that is now repeating itself?

I'm sorry?

N: Will we consider it a form of subjectivity that repeats itself as long as you're on earth. And the idea would be to try to introduce something that is not of that kind of quality and different from subjectivity. By that I now mean that it is inherent that when I keep on thing or feeling or living that many things will repeat themselves because I do not change and apparently I don't profit from whatever experience I get. Because you see if it was dependent on experience and I would change my experiences as often as I possibly can, then maybe I would have a hope that I would break this particular vicious circle. But apparently I don't. So something else has to be done and it has to be introduced, and it has to be of a different kind of nature, otherwise it would not break the circle the way it is. Now for the sake of argument, we simply say that circle happens to be my subjectivity as expressed by my personality. And that what I now believe in that could

extricate myself out of that has to be of a different quality and again by definition I call it an objective value. Objectivity now is defined as something that is non-subjective. So if I define it that way then I have to look at all the different things that I call experiences of myself, to what extent they are subjective. And if I go through all the experiences I've ever gone through or I could experience again if there is a possibility of an objective one. You see I start now to find out if already in that what I have there is a possibility of linking up with something that will get me out of this vicious circle. If I look at myself, and I study it and I come to the conclusion finally that whatever way and which ever direction I look, I remain subjective, then I have no hope that in the pursuing of that kind of a thing that I will ultimately get out of it. There is no reason to assume it. The introduction of objectivity into that kind of a cycle that is (different? difficult?) because I don't know yet what objectivity is, that only as a negative definition of something what is not. Then I start to look, how can I become objective? Or what is there in my experience that is what I would call an objective value? And particularly when objectivity has to be applied to myself, because it has to be introduced in my life. If I try to become objective regarding someone else, it simply means, that that person whichever way it is, that person's behavior, thought, etc., I am objective when I have no wish to change that person, when I can accept that person for whatever it is, in whatever form, shape or manner etc., that I want it to change, I become objective. This is the definition of objectivity. That I will really take whatever that is for whatever value I believe it is, and even at that, I don't want to value it too much or too little, because then I would describe it and again I would use a subjective element of myself of comparing values. So I have to be very careful, when I want to be objective to an outside event, or to an outside person, that

it means that I am not affected by it. So it requires then on my part that I establish a cold fact intellectually recorded in myself, of that what is now an object outside of me and it may be an event and it may be a person. If I'm clear about that definition of objectivity, then in order for that to become of value to me, will have to be changed into an objectivity regarding myself. The more objective I am to other people, I remain subjective. If my aim is now to become objective and by definition I say objectivity will give me self-knowledge, or self-consciousness, then I have to apply it to that what I am now, and now I have to see how can I become objective to myself. What is there in me, that could become objective? Let's say my mind is the only instrument that will record, as far as my mental process is concerned, certain facts about myself. If I take my feelings, it can also give me information and knowledge ~~about~~ ^{start} myself, but I really cannot trace it. And for feeling, in order to reach a certain fact about myself, I have to use a term intuition, simply indicating by that that I don't know really what it means, but I get the knowledge. So now if I want to attack the particular problem how to become objective I start in an intellectual sense to try to see if my mind can be adapted to the possibility of recording certain things about myself in an objective manner. What would it imply? Exactly the same as my objectivity regarding the outside world. It means I will have to record a fact for whatever it is worth without describing it, without wishing to change, to remain for the time being completely cold, and in that sense I will say that my intellect is functioning as an intellect should function. Only a recording of certain facts. And when it does that, that fact becomes irrefutable, and it becomes for me absolute. You see, without defining now the necessity of doing that, if I'm interested in getting around this particular circle and getting out of it, by the introduction of something that is different, I have a chance. So for that reason I become interested in trying to build something in my mind

which can function in an objective manner. That is really the problem. Where will I find a place in my mind that can function that way? I look at my mind and I study it and I see what is taking place in the mind and what I call thought processes. And the different parts of my brain are simply assigned to do certain things like pondering or like formulatory apparatus or all the different things that take place in my mind, what I now call a mental process which for me as a personality with a certain brain, are all subjective processes. I call it subjective because it happens to be belonging to me. How can I introduce something that is objective. By making part of my brain function in such a way that it only records. And ~~it~~^{to} object to any interpretation of that what is being recorded or not allow any feeling to enter in it of liking or disliking. That is really the problem. And if I now can have a part of my brain start to function that way I would accumulate objective facts. And I hope that in accumulating those that I will have a better viewpoint of myself, more knowledge, and really would lead to a form of self-knowledge which I at the present time don't possess. With other words, it means that I want to have my mind function independently of my feelings. If I assume now, it is quite truthful to assume, it is reasonable that I consist of three different sections of myself and I call the feeling, physical, and intellectual centers of a certain kind, at least a certain distinction, and know that also that different activities of any one of those centers are all the time mixed with each other. For me to have a pure feeling is practically impossible because I only know my feelings by the manifestations of my physical body. To have a pure intellectual fact that stays there without any further wish to classify it or without having any associations, or without having anything that might be a feeling about it, is practically impossible too. If I don't believe it I have to verify it. And I have to find out that actually I'm much more subjective than I think I am or than

I even wish to be. The introduction now of this particular--I call it a faculty--something that is not in existence now and it has to develop the faculty of objectivity in myself, I'll have to apply a certain form of--you might call it--a mental process for the recording of something that I am. This simply means that something has to be recorded in me regarding myself as a person, actively engaged. And theoretically it would mean that I could become objective to any kind of activity within my personality. That what is an objective faculty, I try to develop, I call the beginning of an "I", that what is the object is any form of activity or even existence of myself, whatever it is that my body represents including all the different functions. It does require however for objectivity that I don't introduce a feeling. With other words, I use the word impartiality for that. that I am not partial to that what is being observed. I use also the word observation in order to distinguish it from something that is noticeable with my eyes which I call vision or seeing things. Or that sometimes by means of seeing, I call watching myself. Observation in the sense of Gurdjieff means the recording of a certain fact that is. If I can in the recording be impartial, I then experience a certain something that I now call being aware. And under awareness I understand a recording of something that is there as such without being partial. And if the state of awareness, if it could be continued, I would call being awake so that then continuously from a certain length of time I would remain aware about that what is an activity of mine. Now this particular process I will select that what is perhaps the easiest to become aware of because you see the awareness if I try to become aware of my feeling and my awareness implies that I have to be impartial it is very difficult for me to be impartial about something that is hundred per cent partial. If I want to record that what takes place without any functioning in the sense of my mind thinking and if I define my thought processes as that what I anticipate and that what I remember that is that what is still subject to a subjectivity as expressed

in time that then the only point in which I could become real observant and truthful record would be a moment of existence, for that we use the word instantaneousness or simultaneity. So now there are three different things that are requirements for proper observation, one is the observation itself of accepting what I am for whatever it is when it is being recorded, that is, being made aware of or rather that my awareness gives me this kind of effect, the second is that the recording is such that there is no feeling whatsoever involved and I call it impartiality and also if I keep on thinking about impartiality I will know that I can only be impartial when that what is being recorded happened to be at the moment of that what is taking place. I call this simply ABC and we simply say observation, impartiality, simultaneity, those are the three ingredients needed for any kind of a method leading to the possibility of receiving finally self-knowledge because it is based upon experience will give me an understanding and that I now consider a form of self-consciousness which is different from my ordinary mental function. The object of the observation of course has to be such that it is the least affected by now what I call my feeling center or even thought processes. For the object, I simply take my physical form, that what I am physically, the way I behave or the way I manifest and I become now or try to become aware of that what is taking place in a physical center only. because with that I can be, I have more chance to be objective then instead of becoming aware of a feeling process or a mental process. Without saying that ultimately I hope to be able to be aware of the totality of myself including the different kind of functions I simply now take that where I have a better chance of success and that's my physical behavior. Now simply to put it in ordinary words I wish now something in me to become observant of that what I am physically as a form of my behavior, the way I manifest, I simply divide into different ways of how I manifest and we use simple ordinary descriptions like a movement or the way

one speaks, the tone of the voice, the way one has an expression on the face and how it changes, the way one gestures, that is in general, make certain movements mostly with ones arms and a posture which is simply the state of how a physical body is behaving when it stands in a certain way. So there are five things that can be observed and about which I, the little I, could become impartial, and this is work. When I now try to apply this kind of knowledge in my daily life at times when I wish to record objective facts about myself I now try in this kind of work to make that kind of an effort and that then in that way whenever I now apply this kind of an effort I become aware of myself, impartially and if possible at the moment of my own existence. I would almost say that is all there is to it and when that kind of a statement is made one never can go further until you supply that what are your own data regarding the application in yourself of that kind of method, otherwise it will always remain theory, and I would almost say there is no use in talking about it any further because that is what you have to do, if you don't do it you'll never do it. Get some water (asides to another girl). If you keep on thinking about it, you'll never know it because you'll never have the experience. If you keep on thinking about it, you're going to do it, it doesn't help you, and this is the requirement of any kind of a Gurdjieffian teaching, and Gurdjieff himself will also tell you that you have to try this time and time and time again. many times, because the difficulties that are involved is that you introduce something that is completely unnatural it does not really belong to earth and it surely doesn't belong to subjectivity. and that the formation of I as the beginning of something that might grow up has to have a qualification of objectivity which does not exist on earth. Very often it is reinterpreted as something that becomes objective, subjective, so you see there we are and perhaps at an impasse because unless you try you will never know, and there are the statements that are there, but there are many other statements that are linked up with it and that there is a whole

philosophy and a psychology and a way of looking at life and for a conduct

and how the cosmos hangs together and where God really belongs and what infinity is and what time is by definition of Gurdjieff, all of that of course are tremendously interesting and nice things but they don't buy you any bread, the only time when you find something out of Gurdjieff is when you start to work and the requirement in Gurdjieffian sense is work; it is not a religion in the ordinary sense of simply having a little dogma or a nice couple of statements about the holy ghost and so forth, it has to have a meaning for oneself in daily life, not on Sunday even, Sunday I can pray, but Monday, Tuesday, and so forth I live in my ordinary life. The statement is made of course that if I live unconsciously I live in sleep it is simply a statement because a waking-sleeping state being different from physical sleep when I say subconsciousness is a state of being awake in which there is a same kind of gradual or at least essential difference between being awake and between waking-sleeping and that what is unconscious for me I simply call a sleeping state. It is possible that form of sleep that I would dream about the possibility of being awake, and that I think is what really the thoughts or feelings are for any one man who tries to wake up, that he first has a dream and believes in that dream that it is possible for him to wake up. Logically it is linked up with many other possibilities which sometimes one says it is a potentiality for me that if I only can find how to make it actual that then I will grow into becoming something which I am not now, and again in Gurdjieffian sense it will mean I can gradually build a soul, but that at the present time Mother Nature won't let him. We live on earth and as long as we live on earth we will remain bound by the laws of earth, it can not be helped; I'm not a bird, I can't fly and there is a point of gravity that is something in me is a point of gravity to which the law of gravity attaches itself, it holds me down, physically, it hold me down psychologically, it holds me down in all kinds of habitual modes of behavior, habitual ways of thinking or feeling, all of that for me belongs to my personality and of

course, you might almost say it keeps me in prison, and if man's aim is when he is not satisfied that something has to be done how will he do it, by doing something himself it is without any question unusual because if I keep on repeating what I have always done or keep on applying that what is still subjective-matter to something that is already subjective how can I ever expect something objective? All of a sudden to change? There's no reason to assume that all of a sudden when I wish that I fly away. Logically the only way would be that if I could change by some means or other the density of my material body that I would become light enough to float and then maybe, if I had a rudder or something that I know how to steer with that I could go in the direction of his Endlessness. But you see, how do I change myself? By becoming lighter. By the creation of something that has that kind of a quality of density. So I go back to find out if there is something in myself that is of that kind of a nature. I say breath is different for me from ordinary life. So I know that breathing or that what I call air is still sufficiently subjective to keep me down to earth. That really for me as far as the earth and the atmosphere is concerned that also that what I now need as air would not exist outside of the atmosphere of the earth. So I cannot count on it. That is, even if I would believe that air would get me away from earth, I would need air in order to continue to live; as soon as I would be away from earth I would die. The I say that what is a third form of food, impressions. That is that what I feel through my sense organs. All of it is subjective. And so far I have not introduced anything that could not stand on earth and continue to live.

Now there is something in man, sometimes he calls it his spiritual life. Sometimes his inner life. Sometimes he calls it his essence. Something that he really is and he knows it is, but he cannot really define it. Sometimes it is an idea that he has which is also not defineable, sometimes he says it is a hope, or the expectation, or the different words we use like aspiration or inspiration which definitely are experiences of mine but which

cannot be expressed in any material form. And in order to catch them in a general name, I call them spiritual. And if I consider myself or anyone else from the standpoint what is there in man, I will agree that I am material in form the way I am behaving as a body with all the functions and besides that something in me is undefinable which I call spiritual because it is not encased in anything that I know of my body. My thoughts are free. They could go to any place I can imagine in my imagination to be at any place outside of myself. I can imagine how it would be to live on the sun. I could have wings and fly away in imagination of hoping that I would be somewhere when I am interested in the possibility of creation I will create something that will actually give me that form by which I then if I could create it I would be pulled up to that level. If I really am honest about myself in trying to develop something that is unusual I surely will take something that doesn't exist as yet and it has to have that kind of a quality that is not material because material will keep me on earth. So what is there in man that is not necessarily on earth although he has it? That he is capable of experiencing something that has that kind of a quality and at the same time he knows that if that quality could exist by itself and free from the bondage of his body or free from the bondage of earth, then that would I would say automatically go up to that where is heaven or God. That is the real meaning of spiritual. To be spiritual means that I am--one--is free from certain bondage and if actually philosophically it is necessary to reach a state of freedom I would like now to know how can I become free from my subjectivity. And again. I call the word Objectivity because that would indicate for me freedom from all subjectivity. So you see, whatever it is I want to look at and what I want to reach I constantly come down to the necessity of working.. Doing something. There is of course another way. I can say I would want to wish, hoping that God, if I accept him as a spiritual being, which perhaps implies a certain form of belief, because I can not prove it. But I assume that something exists for me, of a higher

nature so that then endowing it with a certain power over me, I allow it to affect me. And when I now am sufficiently open to be affected by it then I hope that because of this influence I will be changed. I call it prayer. Because it is something in which I can believe, praying to something that is higher than I am, hoping that that something, I call it God, maybe, for me as a spiritual being is sufficiently interested and beneficent towards me, to wish compassionately to help me grow. Provided that there is in me a sincere desire. And then in prayer I will find an answer to what to do. Well, I would almost say go ahead and pray and see if that prayer will give you even the one word, objectivity. You see I'm afraid that one's mind and one's feeling or even the feeling to the best intention as perhaps exemplified by the feeling that takes place in one's heart as an emotion, is still limited to only describe the different things of earth in a certain way even if with this kind of a description I try to purify my thoughts and my feelings to the highest degree that I'm capable. I still am limited by that what I subjectively feel or know and that that what I believe in even if I say the extrapolation which must exist, I start to define in ^{terminology} ~~terminology~~ with which I'm familiar. You see its extremely difficult even to reach towards a level of spirituality and only perhaps by insisting constantly in this form of prayer or by meditation or by yielding or by sacrifice of a certain kind and then I say I would like to become mystical. I would like to be on earth sufficiently sensitive to that I could receive from above. I call that now above, it is something that is higher, from above. certain influences which then can change me. When I say extra-sensory perception, it is outside of my own sense organs. So that I could receive knowledge, data or facts in a certain way which are not available to me with my ordinary mind and my ordinary thinking processes. If I say it is possible by means of prayer it will probably mean that I will have to sacrifice a great many things in order to make my prayer intensive. And perhaps in a real devotion to that kind of an ideal that maybe at a certain time a mystic can make contact with that

what is outside of him and for the time being will surely give him satisfaction. Again from the standpoint of Gurdjieff, he is not a man. He is only one-third. If it happens to be emotionally or intellectually or even physically, and we simply say Fakir or Monk or Yogi tries to reach a higher level of being and at times without doubt can reach it, and in that process forget that he is a man. He becomes maybe partner or servant or united with God, whatever is his Infinity, and maybe he emerges with it and at the same time when he does that he loses the contact with earth and perhaps in that loss he doesn't fulfill what he should be. Well, we don't have to philosophize further about it but you see this is the perspective and this is the kind of a background in which Gurdjieffian ideas belong. And now instead of trying to continue to read without any sense, try to apply. I would almost say you came back here. You're here now. And last time I know I talked about the same kind of a thing. And you haven't done anything. I'm sure you haven't.

No--I've done something--I've--But I haven't joined a group. That's true.

N: What have you done?

I've tried observing myself. Tried to sense my own presence.

N: No, it's not sensing.

These are the terms--

N: Yeah. It's not sensing. It's only an awareness.

Oh, I see.

N: And--how often?

Trying to feel myself as I--

N: No. It's not feeling. You see you have to be very careful that you remain strict particularly when you don't have a chance to come to a group. And let's say to be as correct as possible. It's a very difficult thing. If there is sincerity you have to find out. If you cannot find out by yourself you have to ask someone. You know there was a group. You know there were

people here, who were interested in it. Why not ask them? If you're honestly or sincerely interested? I'm not accusing you. Don't misunderstand me. I'm only stating a fact. When I wish something with all my heart I know damn well I'll get it. If I want to make an idea my God, I will forget everything to pursue that idea if I believe that that is really essential. But you see it is usually a wish which is a little fleeting, and it's not sufficiently intense. And when it doesn't work once or twice I give up. That is exactly the nature of man. He cannot help it because he was born I would say almost--practically-- in unconsciousness. That is very soon he became so completely unconscious by simply living on earth that he has an extremely difficult time to even understand that consciousness might be a desirable aim. And if he tries he has to work against--how many years of that kind of unconscious experience. Of course it's difficult. It has to be. Why should it be made easy? It is not that kind of a process. Because if it were easy it isn't worthwhile. If I fight for something, it becomes worthwhile. But if it is worthwhile I have to fight. And when I don't do it, it is not worthwhile for me. It's a question of honesty. Of seriousness of purpose. Of a belief of what a man ought to be. And a realization of what he is at the present time. If he considers his state at the present time a kind of sleeping state, or an unconscious state and he believes that that is not becoming to man, he will try to follow the royal road of developing something within himself which is his own. And which may be developed by something God-given. But in any event he becomes then the master of his soul, if he makes one and becomes independent of doctor's, good friends, father and mother, and LSD. He has to build in himself that kind of a substance then he know he can count on it. And he doesn't have to wait until the law changes so that I can get a little dose of this or that or the other. I have to be if I'm a man, I become independent of anybody. Even to extent I would say I become inde-

pendent of God. Because if God should interfere with my wish to become a man, I'll make my own God who is going to help me. And this is not blasphemy. It simply means that I'm interested in the development of myself in the best way I can. And where I really wish I will go. Never mind the obstacle. It is OK. I don't interfere with them. They don't have to interfere with me. If I have an aim, I go. I follow that aim--I go, without any doubt. Never mind how difficult it is. (Paras para adasta?) It is only through the difficulties that I get to the stars. I don't get there simply by wishing and sitting at my desk. Work means work. On myself, it's me. Not someone else. That's the meaning of Parktdolg Duty. Anyone who has read the book ought to know. Parktdolg Duty. You never thought of it. And never even asked what was meant by it. Work on yourself. To become observant. To build within one's self something that can become independent and can give you in the last instance at least hope for the possibility of freedom. This should be the aim of man. To be able to do at any one time anything that is required by circumstances or by his own motivations what has to be done in the best way he can with his mind, with his feeling, with his ability of his physical nature. To be able to be a man that is(). A man is a man is a creature who can Do. Not a man who sits and thinks and says "Lord Lord," Now what other questions are there because there's no other question? Yeah, tell.

Q: There was a question, when we were having a discussion a few nights ago, which had also bothered me a little. The "I" that Gurdjieff talks about, is this something that is real within me or is it something that I can create by thinking about it?

N: No. I can only start to live, when you give it food. The kind of food that you have to give to I is not your thoughts. An I has to live by giving it practice to be able to do something. And it's only through doing that I will develop, as you might say an exercise will develop muscles. The

kind of food I give to I. I assume the little I starts to function independently of my other mental processes. If that isn't clear to me that such a thing can take place in my mind where a variety of different mental processes take place at the same time I simply give myself a picture as if it is outside of me because I am familiar with the kind of concepts of an objectivity of something that is outside of me watching--looking at me. That I know, I know that in ordinary life, I know that I become a little more objective even the further the distance is away from an object so that I cannot see or describe detail, that I remain objective as long as I am cognizant of the existence of that so I say it as if I is outside--now, how do I make grow I? For that I mean what is the thought in me that is interested in the growing of I, having in mind that if I could grow sufficiently that then it will help me to tell me what to do.

I feed I by asking it to observe. You see, to a certain extent that is a task I give I, or an exercise and I know that if I exists its self. I-self in that way it will grow. How do I make this food by the wish for myself to become conscious hoping that in the state of consciousness--self-consciousness--I will have a certain insight which at the present time I don't possess. The state of being awake is a desirable state for me because I know in my heart waking, sleeping--waking state I am not capable of control, I'm not capable of managing sufficiently what I should do, I know that I lose myself many many times that I misuse many energies that I have for purposes that I really don't care very much about what I do mechanically or whatever it is I consider now my life to be the way I am behaving as a personality that for that reason I say if I could be awake all these different things would be like the kingdom of heaven and then everything that belongs to my personality will be added unto, so I seek the treasures of heaven first. It is to be able to feel with the kind of thought and feelings I have which are as pure as I can make them representing a wish for further growth and that I believe that the road for

further growth is indicated by the possibility of I starting to function. You might almost say this way, something has to start in me that is interested in the development of this I, provided I believe that I can be of help to me later. That what is now represented in me as wanting I to grow must be of the highest quality of that what I am capable and when I start to analyse that realizing that what is really for me the most essential value of myself is my life. That is the way I am living or that what I call a living human creature as represented by myself with breathing or whatever it is that is necessary for the maintenance of my life. Add that therefore that what I hope the little I to become my means of giving it some food has to have this life quality, which life quality if I understand it correctly is interested in becoming free and by giving life to that what is little I, I create a freedom of existence outside of myself, hoping that when it has grown sufficiently large and is mature it will then be able to free me from the bondage of earth.

You see now, what the food is. Food depends on giving little I a task to observe when for some reason or other little I cannot do that because I-- myself, my personality-- has not enough energy left over even to wish it because that what is energy in my ^{me?} is being used up for ordinary subjective processes, the little I doesn't think it's strong--somehow or other it disappears, at least as far as I know for my consciousness it doesn't exist. If it actually would exist. I don't know. Usually I would assume it does not exist because it doesn't get any exercise. As soon as I wish to work there goes up a light up the little I again is in existence and starts to function as long as I keep on feeding it with my wish to make an effort. As long as that is there I could be awake because the little I is there, when my wish is not there the little I disappears and I am unconscious. So like this reciprocal process, and in the beginning it is very difficult, because every time I happen to wish it then I may start to function for one moment; imme-

diately, when I don't wish, I think that it could continue to exist and I keep thinking about the possibility of being awake and the little I isn't there.

You see--

Q: I get mixed with this thinking part--

N: Yes, all the time. Because awareness is a new concept. I don't know it in ordinary life. I'm not aware in the sense of Gurdjieff because I'm never aware in the objective sense. I use the word awareness when I say, yes I'm alert, or when I'm aware of the presence of someone else in the room. It's not awareness as Gurdjieff defines it. Awareness pure and simple Gurdjieffian is that I know by that kind of experience that that what I become aware of is objective to me. That I become aware in the impartial sense and that a recorder takes place at the moment when it happens. That is all. And only that way should I use the word awareness. By then my mind starts to take over a little bit and says, "Why don't you think?" and then it starts to think about awareness and pretty soon I think only. All right. Yea.

Q: Well, why do we need people?

N: Why what?

Q: Why do I need people?

N: I don't know. Do you?

Q: Seem to.

N: Why? Why do you need people?

Q: To help me work.

N: You want to talk to them? Why do you need them?

Q: Oh, somehow for reinforcement.

N: Good. Go ahead use them. It has nothing to do with work. If you want to use it for work those people have to remind you of work. So of course there may be various reasons why you would like to talk to people or to meet them or need them but if it is in relation to work all you want to

expect from them is that they tell you please work or because of their appearance or some way or other they remind you of the necessity you have to work. You know a person need not be alone and he can be quite gregarious and enjoy the company of others and because of that feel more at home. No objection, almost anything can happen on earth, there are entirely different kinds of laws with nothing to do with objectivity. That you need people, go ahead. Who objects to it. But you see, we're talking about work. You don't need people for work. You can go a long way without having anybody around--try to meet yourself--trying as it were to talk to yourself, try to tell yourself as if the little I talks to you. When that is there as if it is a separation, you don't need people, you're complete within yourself then afterward with experiences you would like to discuss them and also that when you try to do it for yourself you may come to a place where you have lost interest and hope that someone else can kindle it again for you. Of course, it's right. Also that whenever you might have experience you might like to match them with someone else to see if they are on the same kind of a road as you are. Also quite possible sometimes in work, you might like company. But I think it is very necessary to realise that in the beginning you don't need it, and that all you need is the knowledge of how to go about work on yourself and that the only requirement then is to do it. To become aware or if possible try to be awake and remain awake and the only way for work is work. Alright? You see what I mean. Don't depend on other people because you will not work. You will think constantly that you need the other people in order to work. Not at all true, you can work right now. You can close your eyes and not see anybody and still make attempts and go out through that door as aware as you can be as objectively as you can be towards your movements out of the door. When you walk on the street you don't need anybody to be aware of yourself walking.

Q: Sometimes it seems as though someone, even though they are there is watching when they aren't.

N: No, don't--don't have any hallucinations. The people have not that

interest in you at all and if they have interest it is just an ordinary earthly matter. We're talking about something that is unnatural. It is not there, it is only a relation between you and yourself which ultimately, let's say is between God and yourself as the little I represents something of a higher quality. Has nothing to do with other people or even as is sometimes said to become objective to others or to notice in others how mechanical they are. Forget it. The only thing that counts is for you to realize your mechanicality, your unconsciousness, your unawareness, that is all. You don't need anymore. Alright?

Q: Yes.

N: Good. Other questions? Are you all LSD ers?

Q: No.

N: because I hope I'm clear about the problem.

Q: No. I just came from New York and I--you know Paul Stigman?

N: Yes.

Q: I met him. I know him. And I just came out here and I'm involved in it again too.

N: Are you going to be back in New York?

Q: No, I'm going to stay out here.

N: Did Stigman inspire you sufficiently--Do you want to learn more about Gurdjieff?

Q: Oh we sat and read poetry

N: Yes, did Stigman tell you that perhaps he didn't know everything about Gurdjieff?

Q: Yes.

N: Did he tell you perhaps what he said was not entirely right either?

Q: Well, I started to listen to him and then--

N: Stigman was in my group, you know. I knew him quite well. Well, if you become interested in Gurdjieff we have people here in Seattle who

help you.

Q: Well, I just thought I'd come to see because I know Steve Channell, too. He's a good friend of mine too and na--

N: Well try to become a friend to yourself, do something for yourself if you really want to grow. And you? What? Your friend back there--yea

Bob--I'm sitting back here.

N: You are! Alright Bob. Have you any questions Bob?

Bob: I think I'll put them off until tomorrow I haven't clearly formulated them.

N: Then, you spend tomorrow formulating them. Don't postpone it. Sit down with a piece of paper and get it clear in your mind what you want to ask. What you need in order to continue to work. Don't postpone it, you keep on thinking too much every once in a while you have conclusions which are very simple. There is even a moment when you sit down to write down certain things that are thought that is a good moment to try to wake up. The very thought about work is always a good opportunity to wake up. But if it remains a thought, you remain asleep. So do it tomorrow, we talk about it tomorrow evening. Alright? Good.

So will we stop. It's the end of the tape anyway isn't it? Most likely it--

*Preliminary Transcript
Study*

*Typed: Sherry Brook
Mar. 21, 1967*